# CONFERENCE REPORT

# Labrador Development Conference 1985

GOOSE BAY, LABRADOR

April 29 to May 1, 1985

Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

# CONFERENCE REPORT

# LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 1985

APRIL 29 - MAY 1, 1985

GOOSE BAY, LABRADOR

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL, AGRICULTURAL AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

August, 1985

CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | MINISTER'S INTRODUCTION ..... | (i) |
| 2.0 | ADDRESS BY GARFIELD WARREN, M.H.A., TO THE LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, April 29, 1985 .. | 1 |
| 3.0 | INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION: | |
| 3.1 | Rationale for the Development Process ..... | 5 |
| 3.2 | Methodological Outline of the Consultation Process ..... | 8 |
| 3.3 | Goals of a Labrador Development Plan and Major Issues Identified in the Survey ..... | 12 |
| 3.4 | Plenary Session - Question and Answer Period. | 14 |
| 4.0 | WORKSHOP SESSIONS: | |
| 4.1 | Overview ..... | 24 |
| 4.2 | Fisheries ..... | 25 |
| 4.3 | Forestry and Agriculture ..... | 30 |
| 4.4 | Wildlife and Environment ..... | 33 |
| 4.5 | Tourism and Economic Development ..... | 36 |
| 4.6 | Community Services, Health, Housing Day Care, Nutrition, Alcohol and Drug Abuse . | 40 |
| 4.7 | Human Resource Development and Education .... | 49 |
| 4.8 | Transportation and Communications ..... | 52 |
| 4.9 | Native Issues ..... | 56 |
| 5.0 | ADDRESS BY GARFIELD WARREN, M.H.A., TO THE LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, April 30, 1985.... | 59 |
| 6.0 | PLENARY SESSION: ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT ... | 63 |
| 7.0 | ADDRESS BY CYRIL GOODYEAR, DEPUTY MINISTER OF RURAL, AGRICULTURAL AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT May 1, 1985 ..... | 65 |

# MINISTER'S INTRODUCTION

This document reports on the discussions of the Labrador Development Conference, 1985 which brought people together from all over Labrador to talk about development issues. In late 1984 my Department consulted with over 100 groups in Labrador representing all facets of society from Fishermen's Committees, to School Boards to Native Groups to Development Associations, and more. These consultations provided a broad basis of opinion on a wide range of development topics, and a report on these consultations provided a basis for discussion at the Conference.

The Conference was a definite success in providing government with valuable information from Labrador people. This information will help to formulate a Labrador Development Plan which hopefully will be used as a basis for funding programs when the current federal/provincial agreements expire. In particular, the Conference highlighted the wish by Labrador groups to have a meaningful decision making role in any future programs, it emphasized the need for an "integrated" development plan which did not exclude social needs in favour of purely economic needs, and it reinforced the bias towards small scale community-based development. These findings and others are crucial inputs in designing a development plan.

My Department is currently designing a first draft development plan based on the consultations, the conference, and other research performed internally. When this draft has been refined, it will be released to the public for further commentary. The release date should occur within three months, but in the meantime we would be pleased to receive written submissions from any group who may wish to do so. Thank you to all persons who have participated in this process thus far.

ROBERT J. AYLWARD,
Minister.

2.0 ADDRESS BY GARFIELD WARREN, M.H.A., TO THE LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, APRIL 29, 1985

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Labrador Development Conference. I've been asked to open this conference and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to do so. After all it is very difficult for a politician to turn down an opportunity to speak to a diverse gathering like this and my political instincts notwithstanding, the issues which you will discuss here over the next two and one half days, are of vital concern to me.

At the risk of "stealing the thunder" of those who have been intimately involved in the process leading up to this meeting, I'd like to make a few observations on that process and on the development of Labrador generally.

Approximately a year and a half ago, Government realized that within a relatively short time, a number of important development mechanisms, namely, the Canada/ Newfoundland Coastal Labrador Community Development Agreement, the Canada Fisheries Development Program for Labrador and the Canada/Newfoundland Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement were due to expire. Accordingly, it was decided that preparations should begin to put together a new development vehicle to replace those expiring agreements and programs in 1986. At the same time it was realized that a change of emphasis was appropriate; from programs which had concentrated on the development of community services and infrastructure, to more economically development oriented types of programs. This is not to suggest that the level of community services and general infrastructural requirements in Labrador communities have been completely address by previous programs. I think we all know that serious deficiencies still exist and it is Government's intention that these deficiencies will be address in this current process.

Given this starting point, it was clear that the first and most important step in putting together a development plan for Labrador was consultation with the communities, individuals and groups representative of the people of Labrador, to determine their assessment of priorities for economic development. Hence the survey which many of you here participated in and this conference, which will explore the findings of the survey.

As an M.H.A. and particularly as an M.H.A. for a district in Labrador, I wholeheartedly support the consultation process which Government has initiated in crafting a development plan for this region of the Province. Labradorians have had an opportunity, through this process, to express their opinions on a wide variety of development related issues, and through this Conference, attended by representatives of both federal and provincial government departments, will have a further opportunity to discuss and refine these ideas.

I think that the Discussion Paper generated from the results of the survey reveals a range of priorities influenced by regions, community and group concerns. We cannot realistically assume for example that the issues which are important to the people of the North Coast are given the same relative importance by the people of the Lake Melville area. At the same time however, we must realize that in this context and in an environment of limited financial resources, that trade-offs are necessary. In other words, it may not be possible for everyone to have what they want, but perhaps most areas of Labrador will get what they need. Certainly, with a new emphasis on economic development and the income and employment opportunities that this will bring, the realization of all of our needs will be that much closer. However, I want to assure you today and at the same time I want you to keep in mind that the aboriginal people of Labrador have a unique part to play in our society and no way can we have trade-offs that will be to the detriment of these people.

This Conference belongs to the people of Labrador. It is occurring so that you have an opportunity to consider in aggregate the opinions of your fellow Labradorians as to how development should proceed, areas of priority, delivery mechanisms, and so on. I urge you to take a constructive and co-operative approach in the expression of your opinions and in the consideration of the opinions of others.

Thank you and good luck in your deliberations.

## (3.0) INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

April 29, 1985

Morning Session

## 3.1 Presentation: Rationale for the Development Process

By Lawrence O'Brien, Director of Development, R.A.N.D.

DAY I - April 29, 1985

Synopsis:

The 1974 Royal Commission on Labrador was the starting point of detailed examinations into economic and social conditions in Labrador. Resulting from the Report of the Royal Commission, a federal/provincial action plan was initiated.

In 1976, the Labrador Interim Subsidiary Agreement was signed as a "stop-gap" measure leading up to the current agreements. Some of the projects under the Interim Agreement were the Industrial Park in Labrador West; the bridge to North West River; paving in Happy Valley/Goose Bay; and water and sewerage start-ups in some coastal communities.

The Canada/Newfoundland Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement was signed on July 4, 1981 and which applies to the seven designated native communities, expires on March 31, 1986. The Native Agreement is administered by a Management Committee consisting of two representatives each from the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the Labrador Inuit Association and the Naskaupi Montagnais Innu Association. The Federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Provincial Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development are responsible for this Agreement. Some programs and projects under this Agreement include: water and sewerage; native housing; education, fisheries, employment and the retail stores.

The Community Development Subsidiary Agreement for

Coastal Labrador, signed May 29, 1981, is a five-year Agreement covering all coastal Labrador and has a 39 million dollar price tag. It is adminsitered through the line departments. Programs under the Coastal Agreement include water and sewerage; community managers and nursing clinics; the Okalakatiget Society; adult education and development conferences.

The Canada Fisheries Development Program for Coastal Labrador is a program implemented solely by the Federal Government through the Departments of Fisheries and Oceans and Regional Industrial Expansion. This program, signed June 18, 1981 and due to expire March 31, 1986, is basically an infrastructure program for the fishery. The Fisheries Program is administered through Development Associations and Fishermen's Committees.

The second Rural Development Subsidiary Agreement signed in 1984 administers its programs in Newfoundland and Labrador through Development Associations. In addition, there are other Agreements covering Labrador such as Tourism and Forestry Agreements.

Because the Native Agreement, the Labrador Interim Agreement, the Coastal Agreement and the Fisheries Program expire in 1986, the funding tied to them also expires. Therefore, it is necessary that we have a new Comprehensive Labrador Development Plan in place which can be the basis for the negotiation of a new Agreement for Labrador.

Our rationale for the consultation process is to involve people at the community level in the formulation of this comprehensive plan in order to ensure that we are right in what we are doing. Also, at the federal/provincial bargaining table we will be better prepared for negotiations than ever before.

The proposal or plan which we are in the process of preparing will encompass all the current programs plus renewed emphasis on economic development, tourism, small industry and the fishery. We envision that the plan will have individual program sectors (e.g. Fisheries, Health, Housing, etc..) but they will also complement on another.

This Conference is one part of the community consultation process - a process which will better inform us, the Task Group, and make us better able to formulate a truly comprehensive Labrador Development Proposal.

3.2 Presentation: Methodological Outline of the Consultation Process

By: David Kennedy, Northern Development Analyst, R.A.N.D.

DAY I - April 29, 1985

Synopsis:

In November, 1983 at a Development Association Conference in North West River it was made clear that a mechanism had to be put into place whereby a comprehensive plan for Labrador development could be prepared. The following January, internal planning for the process began and by October, 1984 the total design had been completed and studies commenced.

There are five parts to the Consultation Phase in the preparation of the Comprehensive Labrador Development Proposal.

1. Consultation with Community Groups: A personal consultation survey was conducted with 113 representatives of businesses and organizations whose main interest is in the continued economic and social development of Labrador. We also intend to circulate the first draft of the Proposal for public comment.

2. Public Service Questionnaires: A shortened version of the questionnaire from 1. above with emphasis on program delivery, promising industries and development constraints was sent to 91 provincial and 34 federal civil servants who deal with Labrador on a daily basis.

3. Large/Regional Group Questionnaires: To ensure that organizations with wide-ranging Labrador interests would have ample opportunity to have their views included, a questionnaire, similar to 2. above, was sent out to them. Of the 15 sent out, only a few were returned although those few were given full review by the Task Group.

4. Departmental Consultation: In this stage, the Deputy Ministers, or as close to those persons as possible, from each Provincial Government department were interviewed by a Task Group member. From these meetings, we learned what plans and policies the rest of the government has for the various sectors of Labrador. Upon completion of the first draft of the proposal, the departments will be consulted again to ensure no conflicts of programs.

5. Labrador Development Conference: A Discussion Paper outlining some of the findings of the consultation in Part 1. was prepared and circulated to representatives of groups whom had been consulted. A representative of each group as well as federal and provincial government people were invited to attend the Goose Bay conference. Through the three-day plenary and workshop sessions, the Task Group presented to the groups and were presented by the groups information and ideas on sound economic and social programs for Labrador.

In addition to the Consultation Phase, the preparation of a Comprehensive Labrador Development Plan by the Task Group has four other phases.

1. Supporting and Working Documents: To augment the Discussion Paper and this Conference Report, the Task Group is producing:

   i) "A Decade of Development in Labrador: A Project Inventory". This is an inventory of projects and programs completed through the Labrador agreements since the early 1970's.

   ii) "Ten Years After: Progress Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labrador".

   iii) "Socio-Economic Development in Labrador - A Select Bibliography". A collection of some 200 works on development in the north.

   iv) "Labrador Today and in the Future". A Social, Economic and Demographic Profile of Labrador Communities". A chartbook of statistics on Labrador with comparisons to Newfoundland and Canada.

2. Analysis of Northlands Agreements: The Task Group has compiled notes on Canadian Northlands agreements which will serve as information on which to base our overall projections and proposals.

3. Submissions from Development Associations and School Boards:
   These organizations have sent the Task Group very comprehensive and well-researched submissions regarding what they see as development priorities in Labrador.

4. Comprehensive Labrador Development Proposal: When all the consultations, documentations and submissions

have been completely weighed and analyzed, the Task Group will prepare the final Plan for use in negotiating a new agreement or agreements with the federal government. The schedule will put the completion of the proposal in late September.

It is the intention of the Task Group and the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development that the Labrador Development Proposal will be the most researched, best documented and deeply consulted proposal ever developed for Labrador.

3.3 Presentation: Goals of a Labrador Development Plan and Major Issues Identified in the Survey

By: Robert Thompson, Director (Acting)
Research and Analysis Division, R.A.N.D.

DAY I - April 29, 1985

Mr. Thompson introduced his presentation as a brief description of the survey results regarding the goals which Government should pursue in a Labrador Development Plan, and the major issues regarding development in Labrador. These survey results were contained in the Discussion Paper released by the Department of R.A.N.D.

In the survey, people indicated that improved opportunities for young people and reduced unemployment were the most important goals they would like to see adopted by government. This finding reflects a general feeling that young people do not face a prosperous outlook in Labrador, and that unemployment is much too high.

It is interesting to note that when people were asked to choose one goal as more important than all others, reduced unemployment was by far the most favoured goal. Improving opportunities for youth was a distant second place. Reducing unemployment was the most important goal in all regions, except Labrador West/Churchill where opportunities for youth was regarded as more important.

The survey also sought information on which development issues were most important to Labradorians. The two major issues identified were unemployment and the development of the fishery. These issues reflect a concern over general economic conditions, and the industry which provides the greatest amount of employment in coastal areas.

Other issues which were regarded as very important were coastal transportation, health care, protecting the environment and the Trans-Labrador Highway.

Mr. Thompson concluded his presentation by posing three questions to the conference for discussion during plenary session.

1) Should a Labrador Development Plan have as its main goals the Reduction of Unemployment and Improving Opportunities for Young People?

2) Should a Labrador Development Plan look to the Fishery to provide these jobs and opportunities, or should it look to other sectors?

3) Has Government accurately interpreted the development goals of Labrador people through the survey, or has Government misinterpreted these goals?

## 3.4 Plenary Session

### Question and Answer Period

### DAY I - April 29, 1985

Following the three presentations by the Task Group, the Chairman invited the delegates to come forward with questions and comments. There were seventeen such presentations. Below is a short synopsis of each accompanied with the response from the Task Group.

1. Comment

   According to the survey, some people wanted "higher grades" in the schools. This is odd given that all schools under the Labrador East Integrated School Board (except Paradise River's school) have Grade XII already.

   Response

   The reference to "higher grades" includes people who wanted some university and college level courses offered as well as people from very small communities who saw a need for higher grades in the small schools.

2. Comment

   Goals for Government and important issues in Labrador as reported in the Discussion Paper could be confused. The resolution of some issues would help reach the goals people had.

Response

We realize the distinct differences between goals and issues and can see how they act and interact.

3. Comment

The sampling of respondents was not random, therefore the survey results are not very accurate and consequently neither are the statistics generated.

Response

We do not make the claim that the numbers are exact enough to draw conclusions from them - only valid for use as indicators of the opinions of Labradorians. The survey population is organizations concerned with Labrador and we systematically selected our respondents from that survey population. The Task Group traded-off between a random sampling of individual Labradorians, which could be the basis of a "pure" survey instrument, and the consultation aspect.

4. Comment

i) Only one Women's Group was consulted when there are actually ten such groups. Therefore the statistics do not reflect the interests of women regarding economic and social development.

ii) Two-thirds of respondents on the North Coast viewed Land Claims as being very important and the Task Group does not seem to see this as being very significant.

Response

i) The Task Group agreed that there is more than one Women's Group in Labrador and we also recognize that each group sees themselves as being priorities.

ii) 67% of North Coast respondents viewing Land Claims as important is significant. However, five other more direct social and economic issues were thought to be important by more than 67% of the North Coast respondents. Further, Land Claims is being addressed through the L.I.A. and Government so people may have viewed the issues as already being taken care of.

5. Comment

The fishery cannot be used as the only instrument for Labrador's continued economic development. The "one-industry" scenario must be avoided both at the community and regional levels. Development must be across the whole spectrum of economic sectors.

Response

There was no specific response required although this comment received general acceptance and agreement.

6. Comment

i) In many communities, only one person was interviewed. How valid is this for speaking

for a whole community and what were the criteria by which those people were selected?

ii) Why is there nothing in the Discussion Paper regarding the legal aspect of development?

Response

i) The person interviewed was the president, chairperson or designate of identified Labrador groups. That person was advised of the upcoming interview and was encouraged to consult with his membership or executive.

ii) The legal aspects of development are not reported in the Discussion Paper because no one consulted raised this issue. This Conference can be the vehicle to bring out this aspect.

7. Comment

i) The questionnaire was not visible to the respondent and this could have constrained the responses.

ii) Did anyone use the blank sheets left with the respondents and if so, how were they used?

Response

i) While this is possible, we saw it necessary that, to aid in the administration of the

questionnaire, the form not be shown to respondents.

ii) Some people did use the blank sheets to add extra emphasis to something important, to make a comment that had not been thought of at the formal interview, and to go back to the membership of the group to get their feelings.

8. Comment

The Discussion Paper puts human resource development at a low priority. This person wanted to see the questionnaire to see how the question was worded.

Response

The question was "that industries or activities hold the most promise for Labrador's development? The question was open-ended meaning that the person could respond any way he or she liked. Why human resource development was seen as a low priority is a good point for discussion in the workshops.

9. Comment

The responses to the questionnaire reflect the past. The questionnaire was hard to understand for people who have a low level of literacy. The questionnaire our representative got (in the mail) was rewritten in simpler terms and circulated to 30 people. Almost everyone asked for adult development. Why are we linking economic development with the fishery, already?

Response

The Discussion Paper reflects what the people told us in our questionnaire and very few had problems understanding the intent and content of the questionnaire. The concerns being expressed are the main reason for this Conference - to take into account views not expressed, for whatever reasons, at the original interviews.

10. Comment

How come the College of Fisheries is not represented at this Conference given their recent interest in setting up a program in Labrador?

Response

The Task Group was not made aware of this program on the College's involvement in the north.

11. Comment

All the issues are important but the variety of communities and their different priorities will be hard to deal with together. Will individual communities be dealt with after the Conference regarding important issues?

Response

The Task Group discussed this possibility and decided upon this Conference and its small-group workshop sessions. If we perceive a need in some sectors for more work as emphasized at this Conference, we may decide on an additional stage.

12. Comment

The delegates should be provided with a copy of the questionnaire for analysis.

Response

Copies of the questionnaire were copied and circulated.

13. Comment

The delegates should be provided with a list of the people in the survey sample.

Response

A list of the delegates to the Conference is in the kits provided. Confidentiality of interviewees prevents us from circulating our interview list.

14. Comment

14% of respondents said Tourism was important while the Trans-Labrador Highway was not seen as important. This does not make sense and raises the question of the accuracy of the results.

Response

We ranked the responses to the question of most important industry or activity according to the percentage of respondents referring to each one. The people themselves were not asked to rank the possibilities as one being more important than the other.

15. Comment

i) What is the scope of the new development plan?

ii) What kind of input will there be after the Conference?

Response

i) There is no dollar figure on the new plan yet. It will cover as comprehensive a Labrador package as possible and will be a four to five year agreement, depending on federal/provincial negotiations.

ii) Delegates will get a Conference Report and copies of our four Working Documents will be available later this summer. A next-to-last draft of the Proposal may be circulated. This is a Ministerial decision - one that the Task Group cannot make alone.

16. Comment

Will the plan contain a proposal for the administration of the agreement?

Response

Administration will be part of the proposal. The type of structure to be proposed has not been worked out yet pending input and a review of other management regimes. We will hold a planning session on this.

17. Comment

In some instances in the tables, the "Other" categories contain the highest percentages. What was this response?

Response

The "Other" category is a compilation of various responses given by only one or two people. They are not reflected in the Discussion Paper but every one of those has been read and noted and form part of the presentations for discussion in the workshop sessions.

## (4.0) Workshop Sessions

## 4.1 Overview Of Workshop Sessions

The intention of holding small group workshops in specific issue areas was to stimulate discussion centered around general topics. The format of the workshops was as follows:

1. A Task Group member gave a short presentation outlining to the workshop the findings of the survey and other inputs as they pertained to the topic of the workshop.
2. The workshop facilitator asked that a member of the group act as reporter to take notes on the discussion and report back to the plenary session.
3. After the presentation, the floor was opened for questions and comments which were noted both by the Presenter and the Reporter.

Having the discussions in small groups encouraged people to speak when those people normally would not in large groups.

Through the workshops, the Task Group gained a lot of information regarding Labrador development from the diverse Labrador people. In addition, it afforded people from the different regions to meet each other to trade ideas and concerns - in effect, seeing how the other people live.

Workshop (4.2) Fisheries — Monday, April 29, 1985 / Tuesday, April 30, 1985

Moderator: Stanley Pike Sr., Rural Development Specialist, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: Robert Thompson, Director of Research and Analysis, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Reporters: Tom Garland

: Bruce Boles

Presentation Overview:

Fisheries was regarded as the top development priority for Labrador in the survey on development issues. In all areas, except Labrador West/Churchill, the fishery was mentioned by people as the most important development issue, and the most promising industry. However, it is uncertain if this attitude stemmed from the fact that the fishery is currently the biggest industry, or that real opportunities for the future were seen in the fishery.

Some of the specific comments that were given in the survey were general support for a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation, the Red Bay Salt Fish Dryer should be put into operation, scallop and crab fisheries in the Straits should be investigated, improvement in fisheries facilities all over the Coast is needed, secondary processing should be expanded, and transportation for fish needs to be upgraded.

After the presentation, the following questions were posed to the group to general discussion:

(1) In which of the following fisheries areas should the Labrador Development Plan concentrate:

(a) Expansion and/or diversification of catching capacity;

(b) Expansion of primary processing capacity;

(c) Improvement of product quality (at the harvesting and/or processing stages);

(d) Greater secondary processing.

(2) Should a Labrador Development Plan have a special component for onshore facilities (such as slipways, wharves, ice-making machines), or should these be funded through existing programs?

(3) What role should a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation play in the fishery in Labrador?

- Ownership of processing facilities?
- Technical and financial assistance to processing?
- Marketing assistance?
- Incentives to promote community ownership?

(4) What specific fisheries projects should be undertaken by a Labrador Development Plan?

Discussion

It was generally agreed by workshop participants that more fish processing should happen in Labrador. For too long fish has been shipped out in a practically raw state, and not leaving enough employment behind. This point was supported by a processor from the Island portion of the Province who noted there were many processing opportunities available in Labrador. For example, a lump roe fishery could be profitable, mussel beds are abundant and untapped, there is room for caplin processing, seal canning, sea trout processing, and possibly herring. He recommended that small pilot projects be undertaken, with the help of the College of Fisheries, to prove the viability of various ideas.

A heated discussion took place with regard to the leasing arrangements of the Provincial Government owned fish plant in Red Bay. A representative of the Red Bay Fishermen's Co-operative said the Provincial Government had broken a promise with the Co-op to include them in the operations of the Plant. A representative of the Department of Fisheries said the Plant had been leased to a private operator in the best interests of the fishermen.

This debate led into a number of other points of general interest. A number of people said that community ownership of fisheries facilities should be promoted so that people can have control over their economic destiny. It was noted that not all Government Departments regarded Co-operatives very well, and that Government often has too much control over economic activity in Labrador. When ideas are put forward, Government says it is not economical, or it cannot be done. One way to have more control by Labrador people, it was suggested, is to make sure that local people are involved in administering the funding programs that come out of this Conference. It was also suggested that Government Departments work closer together to co-ordinate quicker action on specific development ideas.

The topic of fish farming and aquaculture generated some interest. Mussel farming was seen as an opportunity by a number of people especially because there is no sand, bigger yield and a lighter shell. Salmon farming was also seen as promising.

A major problem which people in the workshop identified was the uncoordinated way in which fisheries facilities were provided. Some communities have Plants, but lack good

wharves. Many communities do not have slipways. As well, existing Government Programs allow you to build the facilities which are designated by the program, not necessarily the facilities that are needed.

It was generally agreed that a new funding agreement should have a program that allowed communities to build what is needed. Such a program would allow communities to integrate the various landing and processing facilities in the best way. This program should even include facilities that may be funded by other Departments so that communities will not have to go to three or four agencies at the same time, and run the risk of not getting the assistance they need.

Training was mentioned as an important issue, and a representative of the District Vocational School in Happy Valley suggested that if money was provided through a new Agreement, then special courses for fishermen could be offered. For example, fishermen could be brought in from the Coast to take courses in engine repair and net repair. As well, courses could be done in communities on the Coast. Instructors from the College of Fisheries could be brought in from St. John's to do these.

The proposed Northern Fisheries Development Corporation was discussed, but most people said not enough information had been provided on this topic, and therefore it was hard to comment on it. It was suggested that the N.F.D.C. issue had been delayed for so long that it actually was restricting fisheries development activity. Furthermore, the N.F.D.C. should become involved in all aspects of fisheries developing except actually owning Plants.

The Canada Works Program also came in for some criticism. It was noted that the Small Craft Harbours Directorate forces communities to get a make work project to build a wharf or a slipway, and only then will they supply the materials. The main problem here is that most of these projects are only available in the winter when it is nearly impossible to do proper construction. A new Agreement should overcome this problem.

Some other issues which were discussed include the need for improving transportation, making the Fisheries Loan Board Regulations appropriate for Labrador, diversifying fish harvesting, and establishing a program for private stages.

Workshop (4.3) Forestry And Agriculture Monday, April 29, 1985 Tuesday, April 30, 1985

Moderator: William Pike, Native Employment Officer, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: Gary Myrden, Agricultural Representative Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Reporter: Janet Skinner (Monday Session)

Presentation Overview:

According to the consultation survey, forestry is the second most promising area for development with 56% of the respondents naming it as one possibility. However, only 10% of the survey respondents saw forestry as the most promising industry or activity in all Labrador. The fishery was the overwhelming choice.

The only regions in which forestry received any measure of support as promising local development were on the North Coast and in the Lake Melville area. Again, the other regions showed a distinct reliance on the fishing as their most favourable industry.

Agriculture, or more specifically small scale agriculture, was not thought to be the most promising industry or activity in all Labrador or even in a local area. However, 36% said that developing small scale agriculture was an important Labrador issue.

Discussion Overview

The discussion on forestry development focused mainly on how to use the forestry wisely while at the same

time developing its fullest potential. The feeling of the group was that there has to be proper forest management; the term "management" referring both to sensible harvesting and reforestation as well as adequate policing of the forest lands.

In order to develop the forestry as a viable economic sector, it is necessary, said the group, for Government to inject money into a couple of areas. First, forest access roads have to be constructed and maintained so people have access to the timber stands. Second, there is a need for adequate docking facilities and equipment to handle the trans-shipment of the logs. Linking these two must be a road link from Central Labrador to the East and South Coasts. This would cut down on the transportation costs within Labrador so that wood products (whether saw logs or finished products) could be available at a reasonably competitive price. Finally, Government money is necessary to research and develop markets for the forest products.

Perhaps the most important aspect of forestry in Labrador is that, because of equipment costs, selective cutting of saw logs is not possible. Instead, the areas have to be clear-cut. In order for this to be, viable markets have to be secured for the 60% to 70% of the forest which has to be used as wood chips or pulpwood. One possibility is the use of diseased, damaged and small trees as alternative heating sources for homes and buildings. Again, transportation of this wood is very expensive within the present system.

Concern for agricultural development was not as conspicuous as for forestry although there was some very

constructive discussion. One proposal which was well received was for the development of homesteading just outside the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area. Twenty-five (25) acre lots could be leased to individuals for the establishment of a home and farmland. One difficulty this could run into might be from Councils who would not want to encourage settlement on the periphery of the town limits fearing that these people would then demand water and sewage, school buses, and so on.

The four Development Associations outlined their current and planned agricultural projects. They included pasture lands, developing markets for berries, the production of fertilizers, garden plots, fur and fish farming, egg production and greenhouses using waste heat. Some of the more ambitious ideas were the development of an experimental farm in Labrador to try out farming and livestock techniques, capital incentives for livestock purchases, soil testing and direct marketing technique development. There was the distinct message that Labrador does have a great deal of agricultural potential and that this potential can be realized through proper planning, education, and the injection of incentives such as training and money.

There was also a clear message that veterinary services should be made available from time to time.

Workshop (4.4) Wildlife And Environment Monday, April 29, 1985 Tuesday, April 30, 1985

Moderator: George Parsons, Social Development Specialist, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: David Kennedy, Northern Development Analyst, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Reporters: Ricki Smith

: Carol Blake

Presentation Overview:

Wildlife management and protecting the environment were viewed by 51% and 73% of the survey respondents respectively as being very important Labrador issues.

On the North Coast the predominat concern was that any development that takes place should be mindful of animals, trapping areas and the environment general in any progress made. There was also some concern over the poaching of birds.

Respondents from the East Coast were mainly concerned with general environment issues and that some environmental surveys be done to assess the area. Wildlife regulations, it was felt, had to ensure that outsiders did not kill all the game and that a national park did not cut off accessibility to hunting and trapping areas.

In the Labrador Straits, the consultation process did not receive much input on these two issues except the comment that becuase there have been no wildlife surveys in the Straits area, the people do not know what is available.

The people in the Lake Melville and Labrador West regions were mostly concerned with caribou management and a sport hunt. Other mentions were low level flying and the

commencement of environmental impact assessments on the surrounding waters.

Discussion Overview:

A good deal of the open discussion centered around the idea of wildlife management either interfering with or enhancing the traditional way of life of native people. Concerns were raised that, to many people "wildlife management" means "policing" when to those in power it refers to a process to ensure the continued health and management of the resource. With regard to wildlife management, there were strong concerns that poaching regulations were inconsistent between Labrador and Quebec and that these regulations should change from region to region within Labrador.

It was clear from the discussion that the people of Labrador, both native and non-native, want more direct involvement in the decision-making process as it pertains to wildlife management and environmental protection. For the latter, there has to be environmental impact and assessment committees established - the rationale being that the local people have an intimate interest and knowledge about the local situation. Wtih responsible decision-making structures and a proper educational program, through the schools and the media, wildlife management can enhance traditional lifestyles if worked within a comprehensive set of federal/provincial regulations.

Other relevant issues raised were that all regulations should be translated into the native languages for their better comprehension and that environment issues must be

addressed before, not after, a disaster. The native people in attendance drove home the feeling that licensing and quotas on hunting and trapping can interfere with the traditional lifestyles. In addition, such restrictions are felt not to be necessary for native people because they would never over-exploit the resource.

These, then, are the arguments and concerns raised by the workshop participants which received at least some degree of consenus.

| Workshop | (4.5) Tourism And Economic Development | Monday, April 29, 1985<br>Tuesday, April 30, 1985 |
|---|---|---|

Moderator: Lawrence O'Brien, Director of Development
Department of Rural, Agricultural and
Northern Development

Presenter: Fred Andersen, Regional Development Specialist
Department of Rural, Agricultural and
Northern Development

Recorders: Sadie Papovitch-Penney

: Katherine Baikie-Pottle

Presentation Overview:

Because the subject matter covered by the presentation is so diverse, it is practically impossible to report it all. What is reported, however, is a short outline of the presentation by Mr. Andersen; the other presentations will be accounted for in the discussion overview.

The five most promising areas for development as identified by 108 responses were, in descending order: fishery, forestry, tourism, mining and hydro-electric development. Also, the three greatest constraints to development were transportation, inadequate Government financial assistance and lack of local money for investment.

Regionally, the breakdown of responses for most promising industry or activity for the local area was as follows:

MOST PROMISING INDUSTRY/ACTIVITY FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY BY REGION (PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION)

| Industry/Activity | REGION | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | North Coast | Lake Melville Area | East Coast | Straits | Lab. West/ Churchill |
| Fishery (General) | 46 | 9 | 63 | 71 | - |
| Fishery (Inshore) | - | - | 13 | 7 | - |
| Forestry | 27 | 55 | - | - | - |
| Tourism | - | 18 | - | 14 | 75 |
| Fish Plant | - | - | 13 | - | - |
| Transportation | - | - | 6 | - | 25 |

Discussion Overview:

There was considerable discussion on the place of mineral development in the future of Labrador. Some participants emphasized the point that mining activity in coastal Labrador, especially in the Makkovik to Nain region, could lead to many badly needed jobs. It was made clear, though, that because of the isolation of these areas from the mainstream mineral markets, the developments must be cost-efficient. Processing the minerals on the coast would not be cost-efficient, however, because it is too expensive to bring in the necessary equipment and processing must also be a year-round enterprise; something which the weather and isolation prevent.

Concern was expressed that mineral development is a highly technical area today and thus mineral development would mostly employ outside experts. Many of the participants expressed feelings relating to the effects of mining, or any

mega-project, on the environment and traditional lifestyles given that the values of coastal residents are not usually the same as those of the advocates and operators of mega-projects. It was said that for any development an environmental impact study would have to be done. Another opinion was that development and traditional lifestyles cannot co-exist - there must be an informed decision made by the residents of Labrador.

In order for people to make informed decisions, it was argued,they have to have access to more information. Information must be made available to clients on incentives, loans and grants that are available. This information should extend beyond just reporting what is available. It should explain to the people/clients how to access programs. In this regard of developing a better business atmosphere, one suggestion was for a central information body which would dissemiante information on programs and help proposals and applications get through the assessment and approval process quickly. Other aspects of developing a better business atmosphere which should be developed are more readily available Government funding for business ventures, less red tape in the approval of proposals (to the point of decision-making power in the Labrador Office), and criteria which encourage rather than restrict applications for assistance. That is, proposals which are not appropriately documented or which are sent to the wrong decision-making body should not be sent back immediately, but should be re-routed. Government people could then facilitate the gathering of additional information and give advice on proposals which would expedite their passage.

A key to economic development is human resource development in encouraging people to apply and training them in proposal writing, budgeting and marketing skills.

One consensus of the workshops was that there must be better Federal/Provincial co-ordination of programs. Without this, the people of Labrador can be left out due to bureaucratic rifts.

There was some discussion on craft development to the effect that funding is inadequate and that more research and development work is needed on crafts, tanning and marketing.

Economic development, it was felt, is restricted on the Coast because field staff rarely go to the Coast and tend to work from Happy Valley/Goose Bay.

One key to development is that it be diversified; concentration in one or two sectors will not lead to long-term self-sufficiency. Mega-projects are fine if they allow local people to get involved in them, but the emphasis, it was felt by some individuals, should be on funding and encouraging diverse cottage industries. These ventures are labour-intensive and require relatively little capital equipment and working capital assistance. Further, cottage industries can utilize resources at a rate which will not rapidly deplete them.

Improvements must be made to existing tourist services (businesses, hotels, motels, restaurants) to encourage tourism throughout Labrador. While the new Tourism Agreement will cover some of these areas, a need was identified for marketing of Labrador's tourist potential and training for specialty programs.

Workshop (4.6) Community Services, Health, Housing, Day Care, Nutrition, Alcohol and Drug Abuse — Tuesday, April 30, 1985 Wednesday, May 1, 1985

Moderator: Stanley Pike Sr., Rural Development Specialist, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: Robert Thompson, Director of Research and Analysis, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Reporters: Kathleen Murray Boles, Home Economics Consultant

: Katherine Baikie-Pottle

(A) Community Services

Presentation Overview:

Previous funding Agreements for Labrador concentrated on providing community services such as water and sewer and roads. Gaps still remain, so in the survey people were asked to identify these gaps.

Transportation stands out as the community service in most need of development. This includes road, air and marine transportation. Water and sewer continues to be of widespread concern as well, and housing requirements are felt most strongly on the North Coast. It is interesting that very few people mentioned firefighting or waste disposal, even though these services are not widely available in Labrador communities.

Discussion Overview

A representative from the Department of Municipal Affairs, Ernie McLean, was in attendance and he gave a summary of community services funding in Labrador to date, and reviewed the communities which still need

water and sewer construction. He noted that his Department will have some input regarding which communities receive water and sewer. He also noted that communities that make the most noise are often the ones that receive funding, and this system is unfair to other communities. The primary focus for a new Agreement should be communities without services to date.

A participant noted that one of the main problems with water and sewer is the tendering process because it affects the timing of construction, causes late starts, and there is often poor engineering. It was suggested that a change in Government tendering policy for water and sewer in Labrador would be a solution.

Water and sewer were also linked to economic development. In many cases you cannot separate them because one determines the other.

A participant from the health sector added that good water and sewer systems are important to health issues as well. Hygiene is an important element of health care, and water and sewer is therefore a necessity.

B. Health

Presentation Overview:

Health care was ranked fourth of the seventeen major issues which Labrador survey respondents were asked to judge on their importance. However, it is not certain whether this means that health care is generally important anyway, or that health care services

need to be improved. Among a list of social issues, health care was ranked as the issue which most needed to be addressed in a Labrador Development Plan.

Some of the specific issues within the health care category which were raised in the survey include an upgrading of the Forteau Clinic, improvement in the air ambulance service, expanded promotion of preventative health services, moving the center of administration of Grenfell Health services to Happy Valley, upgraded facilities and staff in all ccmmunities, and more acute and chronic care facilities.

Discussion Overview:

Most of the discussion revolved around the facilities and services available in the Lake Melville area. A new regional hospital was called for on the basis of overcrowding and that the facility had gone beyond its life expectancy. Many people said this facility is a top priority. Other facilities that badly need upgrading are the Hopedale and Davis Inlet Nursing Stations.

A new regional hospital was tied in with the perceived need for changing the administrative center for Grenfell Regional Health Services to Happy Valley-Goose Bay. This point was supported by a participant from the North Coast who said that native people would like to go to Happy Valley - Goose Bay because of the availability of Inuktitut translators. Another person said that an Agreement should fund two more full time interpreters.

A participant from the Straits said the main concern there is a road ambulance and insufficient staff in the Forteau Clinic. A participant from the East Coast said people from his area fly straight to St. Anthony in emergencies, and it's not so inconvenient as other areas find it. He also said there were some good clinics on the East Coast.

Discussion also took place on the relationship between health problems and social problems. It was noted the 40 percent of all cases in certain areas were drug and alcohol related.

C. Housing

Presentation Overview:

In the survey, 78 percent of respondents said housing should be addressed in a Labrador Development Plan. This concern was most evident on the North Coast and the Lake Melville Area.

People generally felt that more funding was needed for housing programs and that not enough had been provided in the past. As well, it was felt people should be encouraged to build houses appropriate for a northern climate. Finally, a number of people felt that current housing programs should be changed to require recipients of housing assistance to put more money or effort into their houses.

Discussion Overview:

Mr. Gerry Kennedy, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, started the discussion by outlining his Agency's programs in Labrador. These include Rural and Remote Mortgage Loans, Residential

Rehabilitation and Assistance Programs, and construction of some homes under the Native Peoples Agreement.

A participant from the health sector pointed out that good housing is necessary for good health. The tuberculosis problem is active on the North Coast, and the only solution is good housing and water and sewer.

The necessity for planning housing development was also raised. Every community must have money to develop land to proper specifications so that good houses can be built. Through the Agreement money should be provided for land development, and access to Crown land should be expedited.

It was suggested to the group that N.L.H.C. housing was not accessible to low income families. One cause of this is the Public Tendering Act which tends to drive up construction costs.

The need for housing repair programs was also discussed. Participants saw a need for continuing present repair programs, and using these programs as an alternative to new construction. Many existing homes can be brought up to standard in this way.

D. Alcohol And Drug Abuse

Presentation Overview:

Over three quarters of Labrador respondents in the survey said that alcohol and drug abuse is an issue which should be addressed in a Labrador Development Plan. This opinion was strongly held in all regions of Labrador.

The majority of these people felt alcohol and drug abuse should be addressed through more efforts in education, either through the schools or to the community at large. Other recommendations included new laws, or stricter enforcement of existing laws, more social workers and raising the legal age for drinking.

Discussion Overview

A representative of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission started the discussion by suggesting that a rehabilitation and treatment center was the primary need in Labrador. This center would service native and other groups, and would complement existing programs.

Another participant suggested that more Government funds are needed for facilities and personnel in all regions of Labrador. As well, funds are needed for education.

It was noted that new programs should not only enhance the programs directed at native people, but also address the needs of whites and settlers.

E. Day Care

Presentation Overview:

Day Care was regarded by 51 percent of the people interviewed in the survey as an issue which should be addressed in a Labrador Development Plan. The strongest supporters for the inclusion of day care

were people from the Straits as well as representatives of native groups and municipalities.

Recommendations on how to address day care were straight forward - either provide it or increase funding for non-Government day care. Generally, people saw that Government should take a role in ensuring that day care services are put in place.

Day care was often linked by people to economic needs. People said that day care would allow mothers to seek employment, and some jobs could be created through operation of day care centers.

Discussion Overview:

The discussion produced a general concensus that day care is needed and that Government should become more involved in building facilities and subsidizing operating expenses. It was suggested that the capital costs of constructing facilities should be included in a new Agreement and that ongoing subsidies be provided by the Department of Social Services.

Other elements of a sound day care program would be training for day care workers, and careful inspection and regulation of all facilities.

It was suggested by a number of people that day care fees be based on income so that lower income people would not be denied access.

In economic development terms, day care centers would increase the labour force to work in new industries. This would help solve the problem of Labrador's small labour force. As well, day care should not only be limited to the fishing season.

F. Nutrition

Presentation Overview:

Nutrition is a social issue which 60 percent of survey respondents felt should be addressed in a Labrador Development Plan. This feeling was strongest among people from the North Coast.

There were basically two ways which people said nutrition could be addressed in a new Agreement. Firstly, more education in the schools and at the community level is needed. Secondly, distribution of fresh foods to Coastal Communities while they are still fresh, needs to be accomplished.

Discussion Overview:

There was general agreement in the discussion that nutrition needs attention in a Labrador Development Plan, and this can be achieved in a number of ways.

There is clearly a need for more nutrition education in Labrador. A new Agreement could fund a person to provide this education and to tailor-make programs for specific communities. Currently there are no personnel devoted to nutrition education in Labrador, not even with Grenfell Regional Health Services, so this situation should be changed.

Distribution of fresh food was seen as another major problem. Suggestions were made to improve the distribution of "country" foods, avoid the damage and

freezing which happens to food transported by air, and build more and better storage facilities on the Coast.

The group was cautioned that concentrating on fresh foods was not the only solution to nutrition problems. Canned and frozen foods can also be very nutritious, and they have benefits regarding distribution. More education is needed in this area as well.

Workshop (4.7) Human Resource Development and Education — Tuesday, April 30, 1985 Wednesday, May 1, 1985

Moderator: George Parsons, Social Development Specialist, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: Lawrence O'Brien, Director of Development, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Recorders: William Flowers

: Tony Williamson

Presentation Overview:

In the consultation survey of Labrador organizations, it was found that 85 percent of the respondents felt that education should be addressed in a new Labrador Development Plan. People of the North and East Coasts were most in favour of the inclusion of education in an Agreement.

Overall, the survey found that "Higher Grades" was the top choice in how to address education, but it was not clear exactly what this meant in that it could mean Grade 12 in one area and University courses in another. Regionally, the ways to address education were:

North Coast - 1. Life skills; 2. Increase funding.
Lake Melville Area - 1. Higher Grades; 2. Life skills and adult education.
East Coast - 1. Higher grades; 2. Better schools.
Straits - 1. Better schools; 2. Higher grades and Life skills.
Labrador West/Churchill - Higher grades.

Discussion Overview:

Most of the discussion in the two workshops focused on formal or popular education rather than on the broader human resource development. One concern expressed was the high turnover of teachers especially in the more isolated communities. It was felt by many people that lack of adequate housing for teachers is a major reason behind the high turnover. Consequently, the group resolved that funds should be made available to provide adequate housing for teachers.

School facilities were discussed and were found to be largely inadequate in that, for example, schools designed for Grades 1 to 8 were being used for all grades up to Grade 12. This, it was felt, puts unnecessary strain on both the teachers and the students.

Most of the workshop group had problems with the application of education programs in designated native communities. It was made quite clear that this leads to inequalities in levels of service; inequalities between native people in designated communities and those not in designated communities; between natives and non-natives generally; between the availability of teacher education programs; and between course offerings. Participants emphasized that all communities - native, non-native, and mixed should have equal access to education funding and the decisions for funding should be based on need.

Another point which was discussed was the "gap" between formal education and getting a job - that "gap" being experience. One possible solution suggested is to have co-operative training programs. That is, formal education interspersed with practical on-the-job training. Thus, it was felt, upon graduation a person would have both education and experience giving him a better shot at getting a permanent job.

There was a good deal of discussion surrounding the idea of integrating human resource development into the school program. This human resource development would include both life skills training, crafts, etc. and teach an understanding of the operation of the world outside the community. The "community concept" should be emphasized rather than the culture and values of the suburban middle class. Local people could be drawn on to teach these things.

Schools in small communities could also co-ordinate human development in ensuring no overlap or shortfall in programs as well as serving as a basis for adult education. Adult education it was shown, is imperative to the healthy development of Labrador and people, especially on the Coast, want more training. A Community College could be established where funding would go into a network of programs through the schools rather than into an expensive centralized campus.

A need was identified for training for day care workers so that better equipped day care could care for the children not only of working people, but also of those attending school or vocational school.

One separate program for human resource development was suggested so that non-Government organizations could access funds for training. Also, this program could identify areas where training will be needed in advance of requirements. This would aid in the application and the effectiveness of human resource development training.

Workshop (4.8) Transportation And Communication — Tuesday, April 30, 1985 Wednesday, May 1, 1985

Moderator: Gary Myrden, Agricultural Representative, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presentor: David Kennedy, Northern Development Analyst, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Reporters: Dan Matthews

: Gary Myrden

Presentation Overview:

In terms of importance, 71% of the respondents to the survey felt that the Trans-Labrador Highway was important while 84% saw coastal transportation as an important issue. In addition, one half of the respondents said that communications in Labrador was important.

On the North Coast, the predominant concern was coastal transportation (both by sea and air) to help alleviate the isolation and improve the availability of goods and services. In terms of communications, a need was expressed for emergency radio shacks and more and better television service.

People from both the East Coast and the Straits thought that coastal transportation and a Trans-Labrador Highway were necessary for the continued health of those areas. More specific concerns centered around improvements to docking facilities, air strips, and roadways. Both areas also saw a need for more local news and information through local media.

Respondents in the Melville Area overwhelmingly stated that poor transportation was the greatest constraint to the area's development. Coastal transportation and the Trans-Labrador Highway were almost equally important. Communications, because they are reasonably adequate, was not a major issue in Melville.

Finally, Labrador West respondents felt that land transportation was more important than coastal transportation which makes sense given that the area is land locked. Further, communications was an important issue to 70% of the Labrador West respondents.

Discussion Overview:

In response to a question posed by the presenter, there was a great deal of discussion on the definition of a Trans-Labrador Highway. The definitions varied, but from the discussion the consensus seemed to be that a Trans-Labrador Highway starts in Labrador West, connects to Goose Bay then continues on to Paradise River/Cartwright where it heads south along the coast connecting the communities to Red Bay and, ultimately,Blanc Sablon. In other words, a road linking all communities West and South of Hamilton Inlet.

There was, however, some information communicated at the workshops which cooled the discussion on the Highway. First, it was learned that it is the policy of the Ministry of Transportation that where adequate road service is available (e.g. the Trans-Labrador Highway) coastal boat service to those communities will be halted. On hearing this, the group made clear the feeling that there will always be a need for a coastal

boat service in Labrador. The second bit of bad news was that the Highway would be almost impossible to maintain in the winter months and if it could be maintained the cost would be in the millions of dollars.

It was the consensus of the group that a road network, if supported by air and sea traffic, would be the most desirable form of transportation development as it would not only end isolation, open up the availability of markets, and improve the quality of life, but would also encourage tourists to travel to Goose Bay and the Coast thus injecting cash into the economies.

There was concern expressed that a road network would not help communities on islands very much - they need the coastal boat with adequate docking facilities and equipment.

Air transportation was discussed and the workshop learned, much to its pleasure, that Labrador Airways has applied to the C.T.C. to upgrade its Labrador service with a Dash 7 Aircraft and five day per week service north and south from Goose Bay using Twin Otters. There was a need identified for the provision of specific weather information to commercial air carriers in Labrador in the smaller communities.

There was some concern that the winter trail system and the trail groomer be continued until a useable year-round highway is a reality. It was also suggested that there be a small cabin between communities served by the ski-doo trails for both shelter and to communicate by radio with the communities in case of a storm or an emergency.

In the area of communications, some specific suggestions were made. There should be inter-community electronic distribution of local news so one community can know what is happening in the others. The radio-telephones in some communities should either be replaced by regular telephones or failing this, the radio-telephone calls should be scrambled so they cannot be picked up by radio. There should also, at least, be radio-telephones in <u>all</u> summer communities.

Workshop (4.9) Native Issues — Tuesday, April 30, 1985 / Wednesday, May 1, 1985

Moderator: Fred Andersen, Regional Development Specialist, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Presenter: Bill Pike, Native Employment Officer Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development

Recorders: Captain C. Snider

: Beatrice Watts

Presentation Overview:

The presentation centered around the interview process as it relates to specifically native people. The issues dealt with included:

- Land Claims
- Native Education
- Traditional Lifestyle.

On the North Coast, the predominate concerns were native language development and the protection of traditional lifestyles in the face of continued economic development. There was also emphasis on education for native and non-native people with regard to lifeskills, native history and culture. Land claims is also an issue very important to the North Coast people.

To the rest of Labrador, excluding the Straits, the land claims issue is of utmost importance. The feeling is that they have to be settled and set aside in order to allow efforts to be concentrated on broader economic and social issues.

In the Straits, the predominate view was that a new Agreement should cover all Labradorians equally - that they should all qualify for the same funding as the native people.

Discussion Overview:

One flaw identified in the present Native Agreement was that it applied to communities and not people so that, for example, an Innu in Happy Valley could not qualify for native funding, but a settler in Nain could. The consensus was that in a new Agreement funding programs include native people instead of native communities.

Traditional lifestyle was discussed at length. Among the native delegates, the feeling was expressed that traditional lifestyles have started to disappear in that the native people depend more on support from Government than on themselves. It was also stated that development and traditional lifestyle can be enhanced together as in the commercial caribou, hunt in the North.

Further, it was expressed that the Government tries to encourage the traditional lifestyle in one instance and then interferes in it through the Police and Wildlife Officers.

Native education received a lot of discussion which centered on the lack of facilities, funds and teachers especially with regard to teaching native language and customs, both in school and University. One reason given for this was the absence of native people from School Boards. There should also be training for native people in fish

processing, quality control and the principles and practice of the co-operative system.

The problems with native education are magnified with the lack of adequate and suitable teacher housing. A teacher coming to a native community from the Island will only stay one year usually, thus breaking up the continuity of the program and not giving the teacher the time to absorb and understand native education issues.

The other topic which received a good deal of discussion was native land claims. The L.I.A. is on the short list for negotiation while the N.M.I.A. is on the long list. It was learned that negotiating both claims separately will be very difficult especially for the areas in which they overlap. Getting hung up on land claims because of the non co-ordination between the native groups would be detrimental to other development and programs. There was some consensus that co-operation between all parties is necessary if this issue is to be settled to everyone's satisfaction.

There was also some discussion on direct federal funding for native people if it was available without declaring an area to be a Reserve. Other discussion mentioned the interview process; that funding should be regional or sectorial rather than Labrador-wide; that native people be permitted to engage in self-determination from within; and that further consultation should be engaged in after the Conference.

## 5.0 ADDRESS BY GARFIELD WARREN, M.H.A., TO THE LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, APRIL 30, 1985

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It is a great pleasure for me to be here in Happy Valley/ Goose Bay this evening to speak to you. I mean this sincerely because this is my first opportunity to speak to a large group of Labrador people since I joined the P.C. Party and was fortunate enough to be elected and appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

It is with regret that I inform you that the Honourable Robert Aylward, Minister of R.A.N.D. could not be here tonight. One of the duties of a Minister is to ensure that his Department's budget makes it through the appropriate stages of approval, and these constraints forced him to stay in St. John's. Therefore he asked me to extend his apologies to you all, and to wish you the best in your conference deliberations. He looks forward with great interest to your views and will do his best to promote them. As well, he asked me to speak in his place, and with very little reluctance I accepted.

One of the most pleasing aspects of this task is that my audience is a very diverse group, representing all areas of Labrador, and all facets of Labrador life. We feel very honoured that you came here to offer your opinions and advice on the directions which provincial and federal governments should take in the future. Labradorians must speak with a united voice to be most effective in getting government to listen to their concerns.

While I recognize that there are important differences among the various regions of Labrador, if we are to achieve

special development programs then we must pull together for the benefit of the whole. The discussions I've listened to over the last two days have been a vital step toward getting all regions to listen to each other, and recognize that there are some concerns common to each area. Concern for all of Labrador is not new to me. When I joined the P.C. Party, I did so under the guarantee that Labrador issues would be given attention within Government. Now that I am Parliamentary Secretary I have an extra reason to be concerned with all of Labrador. However, I must confess to a sense of not knowing what to do first. There are so many tasks that need attention, and projects that need assistnace. Actually, I feel somewhat like the frustrated wrestler who was advised to get a hold of himself. It will take a short while to settle into my new job, but I am surely looking forward to the challenge. One thing I intend to do is to meet with Labrador groups as often as humanly possible; and I might add that the Minister has assured me that he will visit Labrador communities to get a first hand view of the issues which we must work on together.

My challenge is your challenge. We all know how to approach a challenge, for we are here to conquer a challenge. Ladies and gentlemen there is only one way. That is determination. I am determined and I believe you are too.

The Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development covers a wide range of economic sectors and interest groups; and many of them are represented here tonight. I'm pleased to note the involvement of the four Development Associations from Labrador in this Conference. Together they have submitted a comprehensive development brief to our Department, and it is being considered as an integral part of the planning process which is currently underway. Native groups are also well represented at this conference, as are co-operatives and credit unions - which are all groups with which our Department deals with on a regular basis.

The only local element missing is Agriculture but I understand this has been discussed during your workshops, and that some interesting Agriculture development ideas were raised. Be assured that we are very interested in promoting Agriculture in Labrador, and in fact I have grown a number of different vegetables in Davis Inlet to feed my family and I know that this has been the case in many communities in the past.

The Conference seems to have been generally successful so far in shedding light on hopes for Labrador's future, and telling Government the most favoured way to encourage development. This forum has been arranged for this sort of interaction to happen. We want to hear the problems, the successes, the failures, the goals, the ambitions of all Labradorians and to determine how to respond to them.

We are confident that the high level of public input which is being injected into a Labrador Development Plan will bear fruit in terms of effective programs and government action. We must constantly be listening to the people, or else we lose touch with our primary purpose.

For the past six years I have indicated and advocated that anything that happens in Labrador has to be by consultation. This, my friends, is a major step in consultation, and I'll assure you, and also speaking on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, that any plan which may emerge will not go into effect until all avenues of consultation have been employed. We will ensure that every community has an opportunity to make its views known regarding a Labrador Development Plan. I have listened during the past two days and many of the concerns and criticisms are not new. Everyone of you is concerned for the future of your community. I am too.

During my last election campaign I fought for everything from the kitchen sink to helicopter pads. I

used as my slogan "A Fighter for People". Ladies and Gentlemen, I commit myself as a fighter and I wish to remain a fighter.

The people of the Torngat Mountains have given me their support at the ballot box, and now I am prepared to support all of you to accomplish the goals which you will hopefully set out as a result of this Conference. My goals will be your goals.

Although they are not here tonight, I would like to recognize my fellow members of the House of Assembly for Labrador. While we do not share the same political alliance we do have a common commitment to Labrador and I for one am prepared to work for the betterment of Labrador with Peter Fenwick, Jim Kelland and Eugene Hiscock.

## 6.0 PLENARY SESSION: ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

Chairman: Lawrence O'Brien, Director of Development (Northern), Dept. of R.A.N.D.

DAY III - May 1, 1985

Mr. O'Brien explained that this plenary session on the administrative structure for the management of any future Labrador Agreement was being held as a response to a specific request by conference participants on the first day. After outlining the administrative structures of the Native Agreement, the Coastal Labrador Agreement and the federal fisheries program, Mr. O'Brien opened the floor for discussion.

The comments brought forward varied from person to person but the following points were made.

1. While it is good that the new agreement should make available money from new programs, there are good programs already in place (e.g. adult education; job readiness training) which should also continue to receive support. With this support, existing programs can continue to expand and grow.

2. After the conference, there should be a line kept open so that the activities of the Task Group can be made known to the communities and the communities can communicate with the Task Group.

3. In the past agreements, the local Labrador people have only been involved in the management process up to the point of advising the decision-makers. The time has come that Labrador residents must be permitted a more active role in not only the decision-making but also in negotiating with

the federal government. The residents of Labrador are those best able to communicate the needs of their communities.

4. The Discussion Paper, while a good document for generating input and information, should not be used as a basis for decision-making by itself given that at this conference we have seen some different priorities emerge.

5. Criteria for project funding should not serve as blocks to funding but should assist people in accessing funds.

6. Because of the diversity of the communities in Labrador and their different needs and roles, there has to be a flexibility built into the administration of the ageement to allow for a diverse set of solutions.

7. Given that problems have been encountered with the administration of past and present Labrador agreements, the Task Group should take this into account and learn from it for the future agreement.

8. The question was asked whether this conference was an effort in vain because an administrative mechanism was already decided upon. Mr. O'Brien stated that no mechanisms or programs had been decided upon and that this conference was intended to allow people another opportunity to make their views known before any decisions were made.

## 7.0 ADDRESS BY CYRIL GOODYEAR, DEPUTY MINISTER, DEPT. OF RURAL, AGRICULTURAL AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

DAY III - MAY 1, 1985

Synopsis:

Mr. Goodyear first thanked the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies, the LINS staff, the Canadian Forces Station, Goose Bay for accommodations and food, the Labrador District Vocational School, Labrador Airways and the C.B.C. He also thanked the delegates for their high level of participation. The contributions of the two Native groups, the Development Associations, the Credit Union Council of Newfoundland, the organized committees and the other interest groups were recognized. Mr. Goodyear expressed his gratitude to the various federal and provincial government departments and agencies for their participation and recognized the efforts of the staff of R.A.N.D.

Emphasis was placed on the continued consultation with the people of Labrador in the framing of the next Labrador plan. Arguing with the methods used for the consultations is pointless because it is wasting time which should be spent discussing issues.

The two agreements expiring March 31, 1986 were put together by bureaucrats without any direct consultation with the people of Labrador. "We wanted to hear from the people as to how it should be put together, what it should contain, and how it should operate" (the new development plan).

The Task Group, the Department and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador do not have a package already determined. It will be put together over the next few months

and a draft will be sent out for the public's response. But, this does not mean that everything in the package will come about - we have to negotiate with the federal government. Consultation with the residents of Labrador will make our negotiating better. If bureaucrats put something together, other bureaucrats can knock it down. But, if the people are behind it and are known to be behind it, then it has a better chance of success.

We will bargain on your behalf but you have to tell us what kind of agreement you want. Do you want to "tail-end" other agreements or do you want a segmented Labrador agreement? You must tell us.

The present Native Agreement does great injustice to some native people as well as non-natives. The position of this Government is that the native groups determine their own membership. If a native group accepts you as a member, then the Government will deem you eligible for strictly "native programs".

With regard to native land claims, the L.I.A. is on the short list for negotiation while the N.M.I.A. has not yet decided on their claim. It is important that the N.M.I.A. make their decisions soon, because their claims overlap those of the L.I.A. Also, be assured that any land claims settlement will take into account the claims of third party interests.

The negotiation of land claims and of the new Labrador Agreement have to be co-ordinated so that the Agreement will take up the slack until the land claims are decided.

There will be a chance for your further input to the Labrador Development Plan. A draft of the Plan will be circulated for comment. While we realize that our process cannot be too hasty, we only have less than one year for

its conclusion. Therefore, help us expedite the conclusion of the Plan by responding quickly.

With the proper attitude on all sides we can come up with something that can be beneficial to all people in Labrador.

Thank you.

## APPENDICES

I Conference Evaluations by Delegates.

II List of Registrants

III Agenda

APPENDIX I - CONFERENCE EVALUATIONS BY DELEGATES

1. I found this conference to be excellent from the Development point of view. It is now up to people involved in this process to come together with one common goal. A package that will be good for "ALL" Labrador.

2. Conference well represented, well organized and covered a lot of very important issues.

   Trusting that the important points brought out in the Conference will get serious consideration and indeed be included into your proposal.

3. I think this Conference was a very helpful one.

   I believe the task force was close in the interpretation in general. The main concerns and most important things and needs that's on the coast.

   We hope we can still have good communications and co-operation between task force and management team with town councils to put all these needs into effect.

4. I felt this conference was very informative and eye opening. I think that the outcome will greatly affect the Labradorians who will remain for their lifetime. The treatment of Labradorians by governments should not be affected by whether they be Innu, Inuit, or settler but that we be treated equal because our forefathers choose this as our land. This would cut down on the feelings that exist beteeen these groups.

5. I must say we have had a good session of meetings and I feel that now the ground work has been laid and we now get on and produce a development plan and put some of our ideas in action.

6. It was well organized.
Discussion paper easy to understand in going through it in such a short notice.
I was great meeting new people.
It was great banquet/dance.
Overall it did have a lot to do with PR.

7. I think this program was good. Everything about it was good. I encourage the task force to continue their job with great confidence of success.

8. Excellent conference overall. The small group sessions should have been set up in a circle effect to facilitate greater eye/sight contact so that interaction could have transpired more readily.

9. I think this is going to make a difference to government attitude towards the people of Labrador and to know how people feel.

10. Conference has to be considered a success if but for the open opportunity for the residents to expand on the earlier questionnaire. It has to be weighed as to how much additional useful information has been gathered because in a conference such as this there will always be a fair amount of discussion that can be labelled as "bias" and "off the topic". But, there is no other meaningful way to 'do the thing'.

I do have a sense that there were not enough "high government officials" in attendance. While the contribution to discussion may not have been enhanced that much, there is a need to have "visibility" which lends to interest and concern.

From now on there will need to be a vehicle for continued consultation and discussion as the development plan progresses. There is no easy way to fulfill this, the main objective is that the consultation process is in place and continues.

The organizational committee needs to be congratulated on this conference. The diversity of people and topics generated good discussion and the working sessions were professionally managed to bring about the important topics to be discussed.

11. Call me re: meeting to prepare joint proposal for training in Labrador.

12. The format of the conference was good, however when first starting, it appeared that the organizing group did not plan properly, but after seeing how things worked during 2½ days, the planning seems to have been excellent.

As to other involvement, the local Federal Government officials could have been contacted and additional resource people could have availed themselves to enlighten especially the coastal people on airport development and other Federal Government involvement. Notable absence from Conference, Representative from Public Works Canada (a major employer in Lake Melville area). Naskaupi, Menihek and Eagle River M.H.A's. It would appear from this that the opposition parties are not interested in Labrador Development. Newfoundland Telephone, Chamber of Commerce, C.B.C. Overall, except for time to discuss topics, the conference appears to be very successful, I would be willing to attend any future conferences if planned for the future.

13. In my opinion this was a good meeting and I have to give the people on your board great credit for making this such a good meeting and making it sound very clear and understanding. This is only my second meeting that I have attended but there are many things tht I have learned and that I feel that there are many good things that are going to come from these meetings. The reason I say this is because it seems to me that you have done your home work.

There are a few things I would like for your members to look at very hard for the eastern part of Labrador because I think each area has different problems. These are my priorities.

1) Water and sewer.
2) The fisheries.
3) Transportation, mainly the grooming of the trails in the winter time.

I think the Eastern part of the coast is the least part of the coast where government money has been spent, so I am looking for the priorities to be looked at pretty hard in this agreement

On the fisheries I would like to see some help from government to help individual fishermen to build and upgrade their stages.

14. - Duplication of workshops was not required as in one case attendance dropped from 42 to 19.

15. - People attending the conference were not fully informed of what was expected of them prior to the meeting.

- Coastal residents should have been informed to hold meetings with respective organizations prior to the conference so that a unified approach could be presented.

- The method of selecting delegates should be carefully reconsidered.

- Conferences such as this have been held consistently in Labrador over the past number of years, and I feel that not enough attention is being given to community organizations such as development organizations and fisheries committees. I feel that too much is expected of the volunteer workers and too much is taken for granted. The Development Association should be the focal point of representation for coastal development. The community development representative should also be a member of the community Fisheries Committee, because of the importance of the fishery. Then in future this person would represent the community on a continuing basis. Representation of the community council would not change. Election of the development rep from the community should be for a 2 - 5 year period.

- The conferences appear to be less of a requirement as in workshops. Local participants had very little to say, required motivation. In its present format some people regard the conference to be of little use.

- Congratulations to those organizing the conference. Well done.-

15. Overall very well. I strongly suggest Bill Flower's suggestion.

16. Organization and planning was good. We need more follow up for last minute input.

17. The conference has been a tremendous success in terms of the consultative process as it relates to the possibilities of a new agreement for Labrador - RAND is to be congratulated as such.

There have been a lot of good ideas come forth, particularly from the groups where specific topics were narrowed down - the survey and this conference gives us a sound basis to begin the development of a comprehensive plan for Labrador.

It is too bad that the NMIA was not involved in this very positive event for Labrador.

18. Living and working in Labrador for three years and I realize there is much need for development especially in the coastal communities. I say the coastal communities because that is where my work is concentrated.

Listing to this conference I am satisfied you have obtained sufficient input from these communities. At least you have given all groups the chance to express their opinions. You should have all the problem areas and their priorities identified at this time, as far as resident input is concerned. The priorities as far as development goes will constantly have to be set by the Department of RAND. Given the financial constraints you will never satisfy all needs. I don't want to advise you on how this should be done but would like to emphasize this is the most important aspect of your conference. This was mentioned several times during the sessions. I realize assessing this information and attaching a cost may be very difficult for your department. My main concern is, does your department intend to spend a considerable amount ofmoney to conduct the necessary

engineering and feasibility studies to ensure the needs are fully satisfied? Bring in this type.

19. a) I found there was not sufficient time to cover the topics thoroughly. For example, in the Tourism and Economic Development Workshop, tourism was only touched on briefly. Since tourism could become a major industry in Labrador, I think more time could have been allocated for this particular topic.

b) A feedback questionnaire should have been available to participants so that R.A.N.D. could have received comments on specific subjects of interest to them. Participants could, at the same time, express matters of concern to their own group or community.

c) The Conference was interesting and informative, giving a very diversified group of people a chance to meet on common ground

20. More advanced Notice of Agenda. Need for juice as alternative for coffee. Need for donuts (etc.) as the earliness of Conference and for breaks (most conferences take this into consideration I find).

No smoking except designated room or coffee break.

Need for all out publicity to invited local people to come, sit and listen - get a feel for conferences and hear what we were saying for them. Designated "Gallery" chairs.

Wanted to hear a type of resolution format to feel that major concerns were point form and stipulated as said.

Positive - Great conference. Good responses, gradually getting Labrador people to open up to what they want and not being told what they want.

Well organized.
Excellent meals.
Excellent transport.
Excellent banquet.

As we are promoting tourism and want other people's money, maybe an afternoon (another conference) could be considered as a tour of stores, etc. Even Labrador people themselves are tourists from one community or another.

## APPENDIX II: LIST OF REGISTRANTS

### ASSOCIATIONS, ORGANIZATIONS, COMPANIES, ETC.

| | |
|---|---|
| Credit Union Council of Newfoundland and Labrador | Mel Strong<br>Ray Bonnell |
| Eagle River Credit Union | Stanley Pike, Jr. |
| Torngat Fish Producers Co-op | Alex Saunders<br>Mervin Linstead |
| Red Bay Producers Co-op | Gerald Ryan |
| Southern Labrador Development Association | Reg Hancock<br>Emile Cabot |
| East Shore-Labrador Development Association | Ford Rumbolt |
| Eagle River-Labrador Development Association | Max Mullins |
| Mokami Regional Development Association | Bruce Boles<br>Peter Davis |
| Labrador Inuit Association | Fred Hall<br>Ches Anderson<br>William Barbour |
| Labrador Inuit Development Corporation | Sadie Popovitch-Penney |
| Torngat Regional Housing Association | Brian Johnson |
| Makkovik Fishermen's Committee | William Andersen, Sr. |
| Notre Dame Bay Fisheries Limited | Lou Eveleigh |
| J.W. Hiscock Limited | Bart Higgins |
| Earle Freighting Service | Keith Hardy |
| Labrador Institute of Northern Studies | Tony Williamson<br>Leo Hanrahan<br>Sandra Quigley |
| Roman Catholic School Board of Labrador | Gerry Butler |
| Labrador East Integrated School Board | Ron Sparkes<br>Mike Voisey |
| Pentecostal Assembly School Board | Melvin Regular |
| Sheshatshit Band Council | Benoit Pokue<br>Matthew Pone |
| Davis Inlet Band Council | Prote Poker |
| Labrador Inuit Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program | Kathy Baikie-Pottle<br>Carol Blake |
| Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission | David Hughes |
| Labrador Friendship Centre | Rennie Simms |

| | |
|---|---|
| Labrador Craft Producers Association | Debby Briffett |
| Labrador Legal Services | Silas Bird |
| Universal Helicopters | Greg Baikie |
| Pike Group of Companies | Warrick Pike |
| Labrador Heritage Society | Vicki Cull |
| Mokami Status of Women's Council | Joyce Pye-MacSwain<br>Clara Michelin-Nelson |
| Labrador Venture Capital Corp. | Glen Kirby |
| Grenfell Regional Health Services | Dr. Maureen Baikie |
| Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Co-ops | Glen Fitzpatrick |
| Naskaupi Montagnais Innu Association | Bart Jack<br>Cajetan Rich<br>Sebestan Piwas |

COUNCILS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Town Council | Wabush | Joe Roberts |
| Town Council | Nain | Randy Sweetnam |
| Town Council | Labrador City | Alex Snow |
| Combined Councils of Labrador | " | Steve Michelin |
| Town Council | Happy Valley | Hank Shouse |
| Town Council | North West River | Beatrice Watts<br>Caroline Michelin |
| Community Council | Mary's Harbour | Edna Rumbolt |
| Community Council | Port Hope Simpson | Don Sampson |
| Community Council | Red Bay | Isaac Howell |
| Community Council | St. Lewis | Garland Curl |
| Community Council | Cartwright | Howard Mesher |
| Community Council | Hopedale | Chesley Flowers |
| Community Council | L'anse au Loup | Claude Normore Jr. |
| Community Council | Makkovik | Ruth Flowers |
| Community Council | Pinware | Jim Hudson |
| Community Council | Rigolet | Edward Shiwak |
| Local Service District | Black Tickle | William Dyson |
| Local Service District | Charlottetown | Lloyd Campbell |
| Local Service District | Lodge Bay | Malcolm Pye |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Local Service District | William's Harbour | Tom Flynn |
| Local Service District | Norman Bay | Janet Skinner |
| Local Service District | Mud Lake | Marion Broomfield |
| Local Service District | Pinsent's Arm | Frank Martin |

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Education | Gary Hatcher |
| Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies | Tom Garland<br>Wayne Green |
| Department of Fisheries | Ramsey House<br>Frank Pinhorn |
| Department of Health | Warrick Swyers<br>Pierce Brewster |
| Department of Mines and Energy | Paul Dean<br>Alex Winsor<br>Al Roper |
| Department of Justice | Ed O'Brien |
| Department of Forest, Resource and Lands | Ken Colbert |
| Department of Development and Tourism | Dave Lough |
| Department of Social Services | Mike Hobbs |
| Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth | Stu Luttich |
| Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development | Cyril Goodyear, D.M.<br>Garfield Warren, M.H.A.<br>John McGrath, A.D.M.<br>Mike Ryan, A.D.M.<br>Lawrence O'Brien<br>Robert Thompson<br>Dave Kennedy<br>Fred Anderson<br>Stanley Pike, Jr.<br>Eric Flynn<br>Bill Pike<br>John Sweetland<br>Jim Spearing<br>Gary Myrden<br>Michelle Connors<br>Anne Marie Maher<br>Gerry Stone<br>George Parsons |
| Department of Transportation | Don Matthews |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Municipal Affairs | Ernie McLean<br>Mike Edge |
| Public Service Commission | Bill Flowers |
| Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation | Gerry Kennedy<br>Randell Mayo |
| Petroleum Directorate | Ray Hawco |
| Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment | Janet Kergoat |

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Fisheries and Oceans | Jeff Green<br>Roland Andrews |
| Canadian Forces Station - Goose Bay | Lt. Col. J. David<br>Capt. C. Snider<br>Major K. Doreksen<br>Gary Dunn |
| Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development | Art Higgins |
| Ministry of State for Economic and Regional Development | Ray Hayward |
| Department of Secretary of State | Ray Amiro |
| CN Marine | Capt. P. Embleton |
| Department of Regional Industrial Expansion | Sterling Peyton |
| Environment Canada | Dan Matthews |
| Canada Manpower Center | Scott Roberts |
| Transport Canada | Dave Massie |
| Federal Business Development Bank | Gary Martin |

APPENDIX III

LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 1985

April 29, 30 - May 1, 1985

Labrador Institute of Northern Studies
Goose Bay, Labrador

A G E N D A

Chairman: Mr. George Parsons

DAY I - APRIL 29, 1985

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 A.M. | Plenary Session: Conference Opening Mr. Garfield Warren, M.H.A. Welcome and announcements. |
| 9:15 A.M. | Introduction to Task Group Panel. |
| | Presentations:<br>Lawrence O'Brien: Overview of rationale for the development process.<br>David Kennedy: Methodological Outline of the Process.<br>Robert Thompson: Presentation of Discussion Paper, Major Goals and Issues. |
| 10:45 A.M. | COFFEE |
| 11:00 A.M. | Plenary Session: Question and Answer Period. |
| 12:00 | LUNCH |
| 1:30 P.M. | Short Plenary Session to Introduce Agenda for Discussion of Development Issues. |
| 2:15 P.M. | Start of Four Concurrent Workshops. Subject Areas for Workshops: |
| | Workshop I - Fisheries.<br>Presenter: Robert Thompson<br>Moderator: Stanley Pike, Sr. |
| | Workshop II - Forestry and Agriculture.<br>Presenter: Gary Myrden<br>Moderator: William Pike |

Workshop III: Wildlife and Environment
Presenter: David Kennedy
Moderator: George Parsons

Workshop IV: Tourism and Economic Development
Presenter: Fred Andersen
Moderator: Lawrence O'Brien

3:45 P.M. — COFFEE

4:00 P.M. — Report back to Plenary Session on Workshop Results.

5:00 P.M. — ADJOURNMENT.

7:30 P.M. — Three Optional Sessions Run Concurrently.

Session I: Co-operatives and Credit Unions.

Presentors: Glen Fitzpatrick, Nfld. and Labrador Federation of Co-ops.
Mel Strong, Credit Union Council of Nfld.
Gerry Stone - R.A.N.D.

Session II: Business Development

Presenters: Eric Flynn, R.A.N.D.
Glen Kirby, Labrador Venture Capital,
Gary Martin, F.B.D.B.
Dave Lough, Dept. of Development.

Session III: Petroleum Impact and Assessment.

Presenter:
Ray Hawco, Petroleum Directorate.

Note: This session was cancelled due to low turnout.

9:30 P.M. — ADJOURNMENT.

DAY II - APRIL 30, 1985

9:00 A.M. — Short Plenary Session to introduce delegates to the day's activities, announcements, etc.

9:15 A.M. — Start of four concurrent workshops. Subject areas for workshops:

| | |
|---|---|
| | Workshop I: Community Services, Health, Housing, Nutrition, Day Care and Alcohol/ Drug Abuse.<br>Presenter: Robert Thompson<br>Moderator: Stanley Pike, Sr. |
| | Workshop II: Human Resource Development and Education<br>Presenter: Lawrence O'Brien<br>Moderator: George Parsons |
| | Workshop III: Transportation and Communications<br>Presenter: David Kennedy<br>Moderator: Gary Myrden |
| | Workshop IV: Native Issues<br>Presenter: William Pike<br>Moderator: Fred Andersen |
| 10:45 A.M. | COFFEE |
| 11:00 A.M. | Report back to plenary on workshop results. |
| 12:00 | LUNCH |
| 1:30 P.M. | Short Plenary Session to Introduce Activities for the Afternoon. |
| 2:15 P.M. | Repeat Workshops from Afternoon of Day I. |
| 3:45 P.M. | COFFEE |
| 4:00 P.M. | Report Back to Plenary Session on Workshop Results. |
| 5:00 P.M. | ADJOURNMENT |
| 7:30 P.M. | Conference Banquet.<br>Master of Ceremonies: John McGrath, Assistant Deputy Minister, Northern Development. |
| | Guest Speaker: Mr. Garfield Warren, M.H.A., Torngat Mountains. |

DAY III - MAY 1, 1985

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 A.M. | Short Plenary to Introduce Morning's Activities. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:15 A.M. | Repeat Workshops from Morning of Day II. |
| 10:15 A.M. | COFFEE |
| 10:30 A.M. | Report Back to Plenary on Workshop Results. |
| 11:00 A.M. | Plenary Session on Administrative Structure of a Future Labrador Agreement.<br>Chairman: Lawrence O'Brien. |
| 12:00 | Conference Wrap-Up by Mr. Cyril Goodyear, Deputy Minister, R.A.N.D. |
| 12:30 P.M. | ADJOURNMENT. |